

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

DePENNING & DePENNING, 31 South Bank
Road,
Chennai 600028, Tamil Nadu, India; represented
by
DePenning RG, Banerjee BL, Bhattacharya RP,
Jose MA,
Menon MVG, Nair RR and Solomon DJ

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) 4 July 2005 (04.07.2005)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

ISRO:INT:003

REPLY DUE

within 2 months/days from
the above date of mailing

International application No.
PCT/IN 2003/000265

International filing date (day/month/year)
4 August 2003 (04.08.2003)

Priority date (day/month/year)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
IPC⁷: G05F 3/02, H03G 1/00, H03G 3/00, H03H 7/24, H03F 1/30

Applicant

INDIAN SPACE RESEARCH ORGANISATION

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I. ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II. ☐ Priority
 - III. ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV. ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V. ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI. ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII. ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII. ☐ Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 04.12.2005.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AT
Austrian Patent Office
Dresdner Straße 87, A-1200 Vienna

Facsimile No. 1/53424/200

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (July 1998)

Authorized officer

HARASEK S.

Telephone No. 1/53424/574

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/IN 2003/000265

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

☒ the international application as originally filed

☐ the description:

pages , as originally filed

pages , filed with the demand

pages , filed with the letter of

☐ the claims:

pages , as originally filed

pages , as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages , filed with the demand

pages , filed with the letter of

☐ the drawings:

pages , as originally filed

pages , filed with the demand

pages , filed with the letter of

☐ the sequence listing part of the description:

pages , as originally filed

pages , filed with the demand

pages , filed with the letter of

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).

☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

☐ contained in the international application in printed form.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages

☐ the claims, Nos.

☐ the drawings, sheets/fig

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as „originally filed“.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/IN 2003/000265

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
1. Statement	Novelty (N)	Claims 1-5	YES
		Claims ----	NO
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims 2	YES
		Claims 1,3-5	NO
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-5	YES
		Claims ----	NO
Citations and explanations			
<p>The following documents have been cited in the Search Report:</p> <p>D1: US4280089A D2: US5285169A D3: US4888496A D4: EP0756375A2 D5: EP0928063A2</p> <p>D1 shows an attenuation arrangement for analogue signals based on resistor elements; in D2 a differential amplifier with digital gain setting is disclosed. D3 and D4 describe further constructions of such devices. In D5, finally, a microprocessor-based amplifier is shown that serves a similar purpose but differs in technical realisation from the subject matter of the present application.</p> <p>D1 is considered to represent the closest state of the art and shows the essential features of claim 1 of the application under consideration such as an analogue commutating device establishing an internal coupling between common pole and one of a plurality of selectable outputs and a network of potential dividers coupled to the commutating device.</p> <p>The fact that the connection to the control terminals of an RF-circuit is not mentioned establishes formal novelty of the subject matter of claim 1 but no inventive step can be seen in this concrete feature. It is considered obvious to use circuits like those described in D1 to achieve controlled attenuation of signals – also in the case of diode-based RF-circuits. In the same way claims 3-5 are considered obvious in view of D1.</p> <p>Documents D2-D4 do – in relation to the technical features of the subject matter protection is sought for - not go beyond the teaching of D1. Documents D2-D4 are therefore not discussed in detail.</p> <p>Summarising, claims 1-5 are considered novel, but claims 1 and 3-5 lack an inventive step. Industrial applicability is given.</p>			